UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

DATA TREASURY CORPORATION	§	
Plaintiff	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No. 2-06CV-72-DF
	§	
WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, et al.	§	
Defendants.	8	

DEFENDANTS COMPASS BANK AND COMPASS BANCSHARES, INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT

Defendants Compass Bank and Compass Bancshares, Inc. (the "Compass Defendants") file this reply in support of their motion to dismiss Counts 1 and 2 of DataTreasury Corporation's ("DTC") First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement ("Complaint") for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted pursuant to Rule 12(b), or in the alternative, motion for more definite statement pursuant to Rule 12(e). In support of this reply and in the interest of brevity, the Compass Defendants rely on and incorporate the arguments and authorities presented in the Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss or in the Alternative for More Definite Statement, Docket No. 186, filed on June 21, 2006, to the extent related to Counts 1 and 2. The Compass Defendants further state as follows:

DTC's misplaced reliance on Form 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure cannot overcome the inadequacy of DTC's Complaint. In cases such as this where there are a multitude of defendants, patents, and products, DTC's skeletal pleading is not enough. See Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Intergraph Corp., No. C 03-2517 MJJ, 2003 WL 23884794, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2003). Further, DTC appears to recognize that, at a minimum, it must plead "the means

by the which the defendants infringe the patents in issue." But that is precisely what DTC fails to do.

The Compass Defendants are thrown into a group with twenty-five other Defendants characterized as the "Viewpointe Defendant Group." Viewpointe offers a wide array of products and services, but DTC's allegations say nothing as to which Viewpointe product any defendant, let alone the Compass Defendants, is using in a manner that allegedly infringes U.S. Patent No. 5,910,988 and U.S. Patent No. 6,032,137. Like the complaint held insufficient in *Hewlett-Packard*, this case involves many defendants using many products and DTC's Complaint does not satisfy the pleading standards.

The Compass Defendants respectfully request the Court to dismiss DTC's Complaint against them or, in the alternative, to order DTC to provide a more definite statement describing the allegations against the Compass Defendants in reasonable detail sufficient to allow them to form a responsive pleading.

_

See Plaintiff DataTreasury Corporation's Response to Defendants' Various Motions to Dismiss, or in the Alternative for More Definite Statement, Docket No. 167, filed June 14, 2006.

² See Complaint, ¶ 62.

Dated: June 21, 2006 Respectfully submitted,

ANDREWS KURTH LLP

By: /S/ Tonya M. Gray

Jerry L. Beane

Texas Bar No. 01966000

jerrybeane@andrewskurth.com

Gerald C. Conley

Texas Bar No. 04664200

geraldconley@andrewskurth.com

Kay Lynn Brumbaugh Texas Bar No. 00785152

kaylynnbrumbaugh@andrewskurth.com

Tonya M. Gray

Texas Bar No. 24012726

tonyagray@andrewskurth.com

1717 Main Street, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 659-4400 Facsimile: (214) 659-4401

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS COMPASS BANCSHARES, INC AND COMPASS BANK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of this document has been served on all counsel of record via electronic mail through Local Rule CV-5(a) on this the 21st day of June, 2006.

	/S/
Tonya M. Gray	